<u>**REMARKS**</u>

Claims 1-45 are pending. Claims 1-3, 7-23, and 26-45 have been rejected. Claims 4-6 and 24-25 have been objected to.

Claims 1, 11, 17, 21, 26, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1, 7-10, 21-23, 32-33 and 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,807,641 to Norris ("Norris") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,641 to Ishiguro ("Ishiguro").

Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

> A machine readable medium containing executable computer program
> instructions which when executed by a data processing system cause said system
> to perform a method to set up software installed on a storage device of the data
> processing system, the method comprising:
> automatically searching in a plurality of locations for a configuration information
> that includes one or more parameters <u>to configure</u> the software; and
> <u>configuring</u> the software installed on the storage device of the data
> processing system for operation of the data processing system according to the
> one or more parameters contained in the configuration information found in at
> least one of the plurality of locations.

(emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Norris does not teach or suggest a combination with Ishiguro, and Ishiguro does not teach or suggest a combination with Norris. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to combine Norris and Ishiguro.

Norris discloses a mechanism for automatically securing licensing for unlicensed CODEC. More specifically, Norris discloses:

... receiving, at a first computing system, a call between the first computing system and a second computing system, wherein the first computing system contains an unlicensed codec; ... in response to receiving the codec identifier at the first computing system, <u>transmitting a request for a license to use the unlicensed codec</u>; after transmitting the request for a license to use the unlicensed codec, receiving a response that grants the license; and <u>after receiving the response that grants the license, automatically using the formerly unlicensed codec in the call</u>.

(Norris, claim 1)(emphasis added)

Thus, Norris merely discloses <u>using</u> the unlicensed codec after receiving the license. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to <u>configuring </u>the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system <u>according to the one or more configuration parameters contained in the configuration information found, through a search, in at least one of the plurality of locations</u>.

Ishiguro, in contrast, discloses a content provider system. More specifically, Ishiguro discloses restoring the contents data if the contents data are destroyed. In particular, Ishiguro discloses:

Also, a RAM (random-access memory) 13 is included in the personal computer 1 to store programs used for execution of the applications and OS by the CPU 11 and <u>parameters which are appropriately variable in the execution of the applications and OS</u>. The CPU 11, ROM 12 and RAM 13 are mutually connected to each other by a host bus 14 composed of a CPU bus, etc.

(Ishiguro, col. 6, lines 45-50)(emphasis added)

Furthermore, even if the parameters of Ishiguro were incorporated into using the CODEC by receiving the license of Norris, such a combination would still lack <u>configuring </u>the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system <u>according to the one or more configuration parameters contained in the configuration information found, through a search, in at least one of the plurality of locations.</u>

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Norris in view of Ishiguro.

Given that claims 7-10, 21-23, 32-33 and 40-41 contain limitations that are similar to those discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-10, 21-23, 32-33 and 40-41 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Norris in view of Ishiguro.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 11-20, 31, 34-39, and 42-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,558 to Hassett et al. ("Hassett").

It is respectfully submitted that Norris does not teach or suggest a combination with Hassett, and Hassett does not teach or suggest a combination with Norris. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' own disclosure, to combine Norris and Hassett.

Norris discloses a mechanism for automatically securing licensing for unlicensed CODEC. More specifically, as set forth above, Norris discloses <u>using</u> the unlicensed CODEC after receiving the license. In contrast, amended claim 11 refers to <u>configuring</u> the software for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information obtained, through querying, from the directory server, as recited in amended claim11.

Hassett, in contrast, discloses information "push" technology. More specifically, Hassett discloses:

> .. <u>distributing at least a subset of the distributable information to each of a plurality of computers based on information categories indicated to be of interest to the plurality of computers.</u> …wherein distributing includes <u>distributing to a subscriber based on a subscriber identifier, a connection password, subscriber hardware and software configuration information</u> that is used to determine the type of information that is compatible with the subscriber's computer, and category preference information that identifies information categories the subscriber wants to view.

(Hassett, claims 1 and 5)(emphasis added)

Thus, Hassett merely discloses distributing ("pushing") the information to the subscriber based on the software configuration information. In contrast, amended claim 11 refers to configuring the software for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information obtained, through querying, from the directory server, as recited in amended claim 11.

Furthermore, even if the configuration information of Hassett were incorporated into the using the CODEC by receiving the license of Norris, such a combination would still lack configuring the software for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information obtained, through querying, from the directory server, as recited in amended claim 11.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Norris in view of Hassett.

Given that claims 7-10, 21-23, 32-33 and 40-41 contain the limitations that are similar to those discussed with respect to amended claim 11, applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-10, 21-23, 32-33 and 40-41 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Norris in view of Hassett.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner objected to claims 4-6 and 24-25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication of the allowable subject matter of claims 4-6 and 24-25.

At this time, however, applicants elect not to rewrite claims 4-6 and 24-25 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because applicants respectfully submit that the revised independent claims are in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: ___02/07/2008___   /Tatiana Rossin/_____
                             By: Tatiana Rossin
                             Reg. No. 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Phone: (408) 720-8300
Fax: (408) 720-8383

Customer No. 008791